Mr. President, it was my hope that the 90-minute videotape of this United States-U.S.S.R. debate might be widely viewed in the United States. So far, only Wyoming television audiences are assured of a chance to view the debate, but I remain hopeful that public-spirited broadcasters elsewhere also will afford Americans the opportunity to view this program.

FREE LABOR'S UNIQUE INSTITUTE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, for many years—in fact, ever since this institution was established—the American Institute for Free Labor Development has been viciously attacked by the Communist press both in this country and abroad. Among the charges repeatedly hurled at it has been the one that the Institute really is not what its record shows it to be; that, on the contrary, it is really an instrument of the CIA and not the unique experiment in cooperation between labor, enlightened businessmen, and government set up by President Kennedy's Labor Advisory Committee on the Alliance for Progress to help develop a strong, free labor movement in Latin America.

In the past, this charge was limited to publication chiefly in Communist propaganda organs, and therefore it received little credence. Unfortunately, however, it has recently been repeated by some newspapers in this country which, apparently unaware of this charge's origins, falsely named the AIFLD as one of the agencies receiving secret CIA funds to support its activities.

Actually, the only source of Government funds used by the American Institute for Free Labor Development has been the Agency for International Development, and these funds have been openly voted by Congress and are annually audited by the Appropriations Committees of both the House and Senate, as well as by the Executive Council of the AFL–CIO. I am confident that we can take the word of AFL–CIO President George Meany, who is also President of the AIFLD, that the Institute has had no hidden sources of funds and that the charge of CIA financing of the Institute is wholly imaginary.

On the other hand, the work which the Institute performs as a unique kind of foreign assistance program is, in my opinion, an important contribution to better understanding of our Nation and its people. During the recent meeting of the American heads of state at Punta del Este, Uruguay, radio commentator Edward P. Morgan broadcast from the conference a report on AIFLD which I think tells the true story of the work it is performing and sets its record in proper perspective.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this broadcast be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUNTA DEL ESTE.—The Kremlin already knows all about it, so it is not exactly breaking security to reveal that U.S. labor leaders are infiltrating Latin America. Their mission, with a boost from American industry and the U.S. government, is to show the working class south of the border how to organize strong, free, non-Communist trade unions. The headway they are making is modest but exciting and important enough for the Communist Party of Uruguay to put high on its agenda the sabotaging of the American Institute for Free Labor Development through which this "infiltration" is being conducted. So far this Communist priority has failed.

The AIFLD is a kind of pocket-sized, foreign aid program mixing in some Peace Corps techniques, but building bargaining strength for laborers, instead of barns and water systems for farmers, or bringing plumbing to city slums. It was Joseph Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, who was credited with the idea of having U.S. trade unionists share their organizational know-how with other unions of the hemisphere. This led to the founding of the Institute in Washington some five years ago.

It now has projects going in at least 17 nations south of the border. Some of these are so modest they go quite unnoticed in the headlines—$500, for example, to teach women in Chile how to use sewing machines, $5,000 for a worker's medical center in the inland industrial city of Cordoba, Argentina, a $2,200 loan to help Brazilian chemical workers build a union hall in Rio de Janeiro, and so on.

The money comes from the AFL–CIO, its individual unions, from such U.S. businesses with interests in Latin America as the Grace Steamship Line, and International Telephone and Telegraph, and from the U.S. government. Harold Geneen, head of ITT, was so impressed with the philosophical sales talk for the project by labor's George Meany, who is also AIFLD's president, that he doubled ITT's contribution. The industrialists aren't involved with projects in the field. That work is done by trained American union men themselves; men like Charles Wheeler of the Communications Workers and Gene Meakins of the American Newspaper Guild in Argentina and Robert Wholey of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in Uruguay, to mention just three.

Naturally these personnel, their families, and their Institute projects are the targets of furious propaganda blasts by Communist organizations. In the wake of the Central Intelligence Agency's unhappy under-cover ties with student groups, foundations, and individual labor unions, including the Guild in past operations, the AIFLD inevitably is accused of being a CIA front as well. Institute officials both here and in Washington stoutly deny this is true, though they make no secret of their close collaboration with U.S. embassy and foreign aid officials. Everybody being human, this collaboration is somewhat uneven. Some AID officials have been jealous of AIFLD activity and effectiveness in impact projects, and undoubtedly some AIFLD men have looked longingly at the size of foreign aid funds for bigger projects.

But the Institute has something neither the government nor business can furnish—working men who can talk the same language as the obrero in Latin America. No matter whether the former doesn't speak Spanish or the latter doesn't speak English, interpreters are available. And, there is a kind of intangible interpreter so to speak, built into the contact—the feeling on the part of the Latin American obrero worker that here is somebody who really understands his problems and who is willing to roll up his sleeves and help him. Here something of the person-to-person esprit of the Peace Corps begins to percolate. In addition to field projects, the AIFLD finances tours to the United States for non-Communist union men to attend seminars about union organization—how to manage a strike and how to raise a strike fund.

Some Latin American employers, desperate with the almost totally obstructionist tactics of Communist-dominated unions, are paying increasingly sympathetic attention to the unions which the AIFLD is trying to help. Things are never easy and they are sometimes rugged. Here in Uruguay, where the Communists do control 80 percent of the organized workers, thugs have beaten up rank-and-filers who have dared to accept help from the Institute. Communist drivers of a bus line in Montevideo refuse to pick up workers if they spont they carrying AIFLD briefing kits.

But the Communists in Latin America actually have less power than they are often given credit for. Though they do control the unions in Uruguay, they don't in Argentina, and paradoxically the former Peronista unions there, those elevated to power by the deposed dictator Juan Peron, are working in reasonable cooperation with AIFLD field men.

The Institute tries to exercise care so the money, modest though the appropriations usually are, are not wasted. The AFL–CIO has underwritten some housing projects in both Argentina and Uruguay, not to mention other countries, amounting to millions of dollars in investment. But work has not gone forward because governments or unions or both in these Argentine and Uruguay projects have not met the requirements stipulated in the loans. One project has gone through—a $350 AFL–CIO donation to the Transport Workers of Uruguay for a typewriter and a filing cabinet. A mimeographing machine may come next and, who knows, there may be some anti-Communist propaganda to follow:

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Punta del Este, Uruguay.

PUBLIC TELEVISION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it is fitting that, as the Congress is considering the Public Television Act of 1967, S. 1160, a book of major importance should be published to dramatize the need for the development of noncommercial television. Fred Friendly's "Due to Circumstances Beyond Our Control" is such a book. Mr. Friendly speaks with the knowledge of a man who has seen, from the inside, both the life-enriching potential of television and the inhibition of that potential by pressures of commercialism. His book—which, incidentally, is amusing and absorbing as well as profoundly evocative—should be required reading not only in Congress but at the Federal Communications Commission and in network and local station offices.

Prof. Eric Goldman, professor of history at Princeton University, has summarized the essentials of Friendly's book in his review in Book Week of March 26. I ask unanimous consent that the review be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I support the Public Television Act of 1967. I is a necessary first sep toward providing the American public with the full benefit of the public airwaves to which it is entitled. But this act is only a first step. I believe that the development of a system in which the commercial networks, which now have free use of the

public airways, give financial support to public television is the optimum goal. The Ford Foundation proposal, which Mr. Friendly was instrumental in developing, provides such a system thruogh ingenious use of transmitting satellites. I urge the Federal Communications Commission and the responsible Executive agencies to take immediate steps to develop such a system. In my view, such action would be wholly consistent with, and inded would complement, the work of the Congress in considering the Public Television Act of 1967.

EXHIBIT 1

THE TRAGEDY OF AMERICAN TELEVISION

(By Eric F. Goldman)

American television is too young to have developed a genuine literature. We have writings galore about it but few of the richer variety, the memoirs and biographies of the people who actually built TV and the deeper-cutting analytical discussions. As a real literature develops, surely an important place will go to this book by the longtime CBS producer and executive, Fred W. Friendly. It is a loosely constructed volume, compounded of history, memoir, polemic, and pleading. However constructed, it is a forceful book, enormously informed, tartly analytical, astute, passionate, and disturbing. No one can read it without a sharply heightened sense of the tragedy of American TV.

Friendly is much too good a TV man not to keep the basic structure of his book a continuous and decidedly human story. It starts in the late 1940s, when the formidable team of Edward R. Murrow and Friendly began to function. Dramatic chapters go behind the scenes of the famous telecasts which did so much to remove the odium of "security risk" from Lieutenant Milo Radulovich and the odium of Senator Joseph McCarthy from the United States. Then, in its hard-driving way, the book moves through other triumphs of *See It Now* and the "strange death" of the program, the unsteady days of *Small World*, the development of the split between the CBS and its great ornament, Murrow, the thunder and the tribulations of *CBS Reports*, the embattled years of Friendly as head of CBS's powerful news operation, and the final clash which led to the uproar of his resignation and his present association with Columbia University and the Ford Foundation.

Friendly keeps his pages moving with a rapid fire of anecdotes, revealing, moving, or amusing. There are the incidents of ex-president Eisenhower and President Kennedy both turning down a proposal to appear on TV, the one because he feared the joint appearance would make him appear too old, the other because it could make him seem too young; the stormy executive clash at CBS, with Executive Producer Fred Friendly turning on Chairman of the Board William S. Paley and stomping out the door which led not to the hall but to the private lavatory ("It took me five years to be able to laugh about that—and it was just about that long before I was in his office again"); the secene in the studio as Murrow finished his program on Lieutenant Radulovich, Murrow bathed in sweat and smoke in the air-conditioned room, the technicians, some with tears in their eyes, gathered around him to shake his hand; and the times when Friendly, without adequate sponsorship for an hour of Danny Kaye's UNICEF world trip, went out and hawked the program himself and Murrow faced with the same situation for Marian Anderson, muttered as he reached for the phone, "If Friendly can sell Danny Kaye, I can sell the Lady from Philadelphia."

But the story aspects of the book, however readable, are anything but its central purpose. Fred Friendly is an outraged man. He is a TV enthusiast and, nostalgically, a CBS enthusiast. He believes that the medium and the network did great things in the news and documentary fields and that both have enormous possibilities for the future. He also believes that—for some time and especially today—both have been shirking their potentialities, not to speak of their legal duty, in order to make bigger and bigger profits.

Many people in the TV industry have awaited this book, with glee or indignation, as an insider's assault on the titans of CBS. It does indict and it does present Paley, Frank Stanton, the president of CBS, and others in a way that will hardly delight them. No doubt they will disagree with some of his statements of fact and many of his interpretations, as they have already done publicly in certain instances. But the essence of the book is that it is not really a discussion of personalities at all. It is a criticism of American TV as an institution.

Although Friendly disavows any intention to write an "expose," inevitably the book takes on something of that nature and the reader is reminded of the muck-raking of Lincoln Steffens. The more Steffens looked at the condition of American cities in the early 20th century, the more he became convinced that the critical trouble came not from evil men but from a system which made good men do evil things and encouraged evil men to be themselves. The more Friendly's volume goes on, the more he hammers at "the system that keeps such unremitting pressure on men like Paley and Stanton."

In writing of this type, of course, the author appears basically right and his opponents basically wrong. But Friendly's emphasis on The System is such that his account is not simply the goodies *vs.* the baddies. Of himself, he says: "Possibly if I were in their jobs [the jobs of Paley and Stanton] I would have behaved as they did." He includes other comments about Fred Friendly that will surprise people who have not thought of humility and self-criticism as among his more marked characteristics. He speaks of his own moments of "arrogance," "lack of will power," and "tailorings" of conscience, and he includes a delicious quotation. "Friendly," a colleague remarked, "you'll never have a nervous breakdown, but you sure are a carrier." He has good words for Messrs. Paley and Stanton. They are "honorable men," of intelligence, taste, and a sense of public responsibility—and more and more caught in The System.

Friendly's description of The System, in many fundamentals, follows familiar lines. Quickly TV became big business with shareholders demanding that the profits be higher year after year. Advertisers bought time according to the Nielsen ratings, and the highest ratings customarily went to least-common-denominator programs of mediocre quality. Management either went after these profits—cutting down on the time given to unprofitable quality shows—or the stockholders would see to it that it ceased to be the management. In Friendly's analysis, the Paleys and the Stantons, whatever their imposing titles, lost control over the programing, which went to the TV merchandisers beneath them on the organization chart.

But if the broad outline of his analysis is familiar, the outline is filled in with so many nuances and such an abundance of fresh detail that it takes on the quality of the new. In particular, Friendly adds dimension to the discussion of the deeper effects of the quiz programs on the inner workings of TV; the meaning of the rigmarole of presidents and vice-presidents; and the enormous power in a network of its allegedly subordinate local stations.

In Friendly's book, The System rolls on so inexorably that it raises a question. I do not know whether he intends to say this but his System seems so ironclad that it leaves little or no room for improvement in commercial TV. Is this actually realistic, if a number of TV leaders have the intelligence, character, and taste he describes and are operating under pressure from mounting criticism? Moreover, Friendly makes the market the dynamo of The System. He does not mention the polls which indicate that the better educated and upper-income, a market indeed, are increasingly turning off their TV sets, providing a highly practical incentive to get those sets on again by offering more of the types of programs which Friendly seeks. After all, Lincoln Steffens' deeply entrenched System of municipal government was not impervious to change, by pressures from within and without.

Be that as it may, he concludes his book with a quick but shrewd appraisal of the many plans which have been suggested to break or to supplement The System from the outside. Naturally enough, Friendly gives most emphasis to the idea which he originated and then worked out with McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation—the proposal for a constellation of satellites serving the long-line needs of all broadcasters and operated by a non-profit corporation which would use its profits to finance a noncommercial network. Here Friendly's knowledgeable prediction should be noted: "Some satellite system benefiting noncommercial television is going to emerge in the coming months."

More than his knowledgeability, the end of the book expresses his passion about TV. The accidents of the medium brought Fred Friendly into association with that remarkable American, Edward R. Murrow. He was so influenced because the two men, in their very different ways, had the same fire in their bellies—a fire made up of all kinds of elements but including that age-old American emotion which insists that when something new comes along, it should be used to help the ordinary American become less ordinary.

Friendly left his influential post as president of CBS News in a turmoil of doubt. A particular juncture of events triggered his conclusion that he had to get out from The System "while I still could." Yet obviously he had enjoyed his powerful position tremendously—enjoyed the power as power and enjoyed using it for the public service purposes to which, whatever the problems, it could be put. But now with his resignation, as he writes somewhat melodramatically, he was no longer a man at "the big switch." He consoles himself: "If I can't tend the big switch, perhaps I can carry a spear or write a pamphlet or stoke a fire."

Fred Friendly should rest happy with his consolation. He has written not a pamphlet but a major book. He has stoked the fire of criticism of TV in a way which in the long run, I suspect, will serve the people of the United States as effectively as the memorable TV hours which he did so much to create.

NEW YORK TIMES OFF THE RAILS ON DAIRY IMPORTS—SECRETARY FREEMAN GIVES THE FACTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on April 17 Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman took the New York Times to task for criticizing his efforts to impose stricter quota controls on dairy imports. I know that the 52 Senators who joined me in sponsoring my dairy import bill were as pleased as I was to have Secretary Freeman on our side. As his letter indicates, he is a valuable ally, always in command of the facts, who speaks with great authority.

In his letter the Secretary cited an example of the present evasion of dairy import quotas set up under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act as a safe-